

ORIGINAL



0000167703

MEMORANDUM

RECEIVED

TO: Docket Control

FROM: Matthew Rowell *MR*
Policy Advisor to Interim Chairman Doug Little

2016 JAN 26 A 11:19

AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

DATE: January 26, 2015

RE: In the matter of the application of Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc., for a hearing to determine the fair value of its property for ratemaking purposes, to fix a just and reasonable return thereon, to approve rates designed to develop such return and for related approvals.

Docket Number E-01575A-15-0312

Interim Chairman Little received the attached email from a constituent and believes it should be included in the above listed docket.

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

JAN 26 2016

DOCKETED BY	<i>KG</i>
-------------	-----------

Matthew J. Rowell

From: Little-Web
Sent: Monday, January 25, 2016 3:45 PM
To: Matthew J. Rowell
Subject: FW: SSVEV petion. Docket #'s E-01575A-15-0312 & E-01575A-15-0127

Matt,

Can you please get this filed to the appropriate docket and let him know we have received it.

Best regards,

Doug

Doug Little
Commissioner
Arizona Corporation Commission

-----Original Message-----

From: Timothy Doyle [<mailto:tedoyle@cox.net>]
Sent: Monday, January 18, 2016 12:01 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: SSVEV petion. Docket #'s E-01575A-15-0312 & E-01575A-15-0127

January 16, 2016
2310 E. Suma Dr.
Sierra Vista, AZ 85650

To the Arizona Corporation Commission:

Sirs:

I am a homeowner with solar. I have heard much discussion about the changes that Sulfur Springs Valley Electric proposes to make in its rate structure over the next few years. This has been based on solar homeowners that are net zero. Of the 1300 or so members that have solar, only 700 or so are net zero. SSVEC asserts that ALL solar owners do not pay their fair share of the cost of maintaining the grid.

As one of those who are not net zero I am paying into SSVEC's grid some \$60/month average in electric bills. Am I, or any of those that are not net zero, NOT paying to keep up the electric companies infrastructure? Any customer of any electric company that is not net zero NEEDS to be treated differently than net zero customers. This has not been addressed in SSVEC proposal to the ACC. You should send the whole proposal back to SSVEC to have them justify the \$50 cost to all solar panel users.

If you pass any ruling with out taking this in to account then you are DOUBLE penalizing the non net zero customer. First for having rooftop solar and then for paying their FAIR share into the system. I am just a smaller customer in the system so why am I being charged for having solar panels on my house? I know customers that pay less than I do per month. Should they not be paying the same \$50/month that I would be paying in base charges?

This whole issue has not been thought out and the electric companies are acting prematurely. There have been independent studies that show that rooftop solar has very little impact on the average electric customer now. Yes it may come to pass that there will be a time when the rate structure will have to change but that will be in the future when the percent of roof top solar is much higher than it is now.

Sincerely,

Timothy Doyle

Solar Homeowner